

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

Listing of Claims:

Claim 1 (original): A computer implemented method for performing compliance checking on a request associated with a party to determine if, in view of a relationship between the party and an entity, the request complies with specified restrictions, the method comprising the steps of:

- (a) receiving a compliance request having an associated party and indicating a particular instrument associated with an issuer;
- (b) retrieving restrictions associated with the particular instrument from a collection of restrictions;
- (c) accessing a compliance rule set identifying at least one compliance rule selected in accordance with a profile associated with the party, the profile reflecting at least the relationship between the party and the entity;
- (d) evaluating at least a portion of the rules in the compliance rule set using the retrieved restrictions to determine if the request complies with the restrictions; and
- (e) outputting a message in electronic form indicating a compliance condition in accordance with results of the evaluating step.

Claim 2 (original): The method of claim 1, wherein each compliance rule has an associated priority, the priority indicating an order in which the rules are applied during the evaluating step.

Claim 3 (original): The method of claim 2, wherein the restrictions are indicated in a plurality of lists including a first list indicating restrictions related to publicly available information and a second list indicating restrictions related to non-public information; the priority of rules applying to the first list being greater than the priority of rules applying to the second list.

AS Claim 4 (currently amended): The method of claim 1, wherein:

- the restrictions are indicated in least a first list and restrictions in the first list have an associated severity level;
- the step of retrieving comprising retrieving restrictions from the first list wherein, if a plurality of

As
cert

restrictions associated with the particular instrument is in the first list, retrieving from the first list only the restriction associated with the particular instrument having the highest severity level[;]

Claim 5 (original): The method of claim 1, wherein restrictions are transaction restrictions and each restriction has an associated severity level selected from a group comprising at least one of a low severity indicating that transactions are permitted for a party in a first category and not permitted for a party in a second category, and a high severity indicating that transactions are not permitted for any party.

Claim 6 (original): The method of claim 5, wherein the first category comprise customers of the entity and the second category comprises employees of the entity.

Claim 7 (original) The method of claim 5, wherein the severity group further comprises a medium severity indicating that transactions are permitted only with additional approval.

Claim 8 (original): The method of claim 1, wherein the step of accessing a compliance rule set comprises:

- accessing a baseline rule set;
- accessing at least one additional rule set selected in accordance with the party profile; and
- combining the accessed baseline rule set and the at least one additional rule set to form the compliance rule set.

Claim 9 (original): The method of claim 8, further combining the steps of:

- accessing rule exception data selected in accordance with the party profile; and
- removing rules from the compliance rule set in accordance with the rule exception data.

Claim 10 (original): The method of claim 1, wherein the request is received from the party and the message is sent to the party.

Claim 11 (original): The method of claim 1, wherein the request is received from an electronic trading system and the output message is sent to the electronic trading system.

Claim 12 (original): The method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

logging requests where a determination is made that the request violates the restrictions; re-executing steps (b) – (d) on a periodic basis for logged requests;

if a re-execution indicates that a particular logged request does not violate the restrictions, outputting a message indicating the request approval.

Claim 13 (original): The method of claim 1, wherein the entity comprises a company and the party comprises one of an employee of the company, a customer of the company, and the company.

Claim 14 (original): The method of claim 1, wherein the compliance request comprises an electronic document containing data indicating a company name;

the method further comprising the steps of extracting the company name from the document and mapping the extracted company name to an associated instrument.

Claim 15 (original): The method of claim 14, further comprising the step of embedding the compliance condition message in a representation of the document.

A⁹
Claim 16 (currently amended): A computer implemented method for performing compliance checking on a transaction request associated with a party to determine if, in view of a relationship between the party and an entity, the transaction request complies with specified restrictions, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) providing a collection of compliance rules, at least some compliance rules having an associated priority;

(b) receiving a transaction compliance request having an associated party and indicating a particular instrument associated with an issuer;

(c) retrieving transaction restrictions associated with the particular instrument from a collection of restrictions;

(d) accessing a profile associated with the party, the profile reflecting at least the relationship between the party and the entity;

(e) generating a compliance rule set identifying at least one compliance rule in the collection of compliance rules by combining a baseline rule set and at least one additional rule set selected in

A⁹
cont
accordance with the party profile;

(f) evaluating at least a portion of the rules in the compliance rule in order of the associated rule priorities using the retrieved restrictions to determine if the transaction request complies with the restrictions; and

[(e)] (g) outputting a message in electronic form indicating if the transaction is complies with the restrictions in accordance with results of the evaluating step.

Claim 17 (original): The method of claim 16, wherein the restrictions are indicated in a plurality of restricted transaction lists including a first list indicating restrictions related to publicly available information and a second list indicating restrictions related to non-public information; the priority of rules applying to the first list being greater than the priority of rules applying to the second list.

Claim 18 (original): The method of claim 16, wherein the step of generating further comprises accessing rule exception data selected in accordance with the party profile and removing rules from the compliance rule set in accordance with the rule exception data.

Claim 19 (original): The method of claim 16, further comprising the steps of:

logging transaction requests where a determination is made that the transaction does not comply with the restrictions;

re-executing steps (d) – (f) on a periodic basis for logged transaction requests; and

if a re-execution indicates that a particular logged transaction request does not violate the restrictions, outputting a message indicating approval of the transaction request.

A¹⁰
Claim 20 (currently amended): The method of claim 16, wherein the entity comprises a company and the party comprises one of an employee of the company, a customer of the company, and the company.

Claim 21 (original): A system for performing compliance checking on a request associated with a party to determine if, in view of a relationship between the party and an entity, the request complies with specified restrictions, the system comprising:

a list server having access to data indicating financial instruments subject to restrictions and configured to in receive a query indicating a particular instrument and return data indicating restrictions

associated with the particular instrument;

a rules database comprising a plurality of compliance rules;

a profile database storing profile information for a plurality of parties, profiles reflecting at least the relationship between each respective party and the entity;

a rules engine connected to the rules database and configured to:

(a) receive a compliance request indicating a particular instrument and having an associated party;

(b) issue a query to the list server to obtain restrictions related to the particular instrument;

(c) access a compliance rule set identifying at least one compliance rule selected in accordance with the party profile;

(d) evaluate at least a portion of the rules in the compliance rule set using the obtained restrictions; and

(e) output a message indicating a compliance condition for the request in accordance with the evaluating step.

Claim 22 (original): The system of claim 21, wherein the system further comprises an account database associating accounts with respective parties;

the request comprising a transaction request and specifying a transaction account;

the rules engine being further configured to access the account database using the specified transaction account to determine the party.

Claim 23 (original): The system of claim 21, wherein the restrictions are contained in a plurality of lists, wherein restrictions on a specific instrument can appear in multiple lists and multiple times in a single list;

the list server comprising a list cache configured to store transaction restriction data from the plurality of lists.

Claim 24 (original). The system of claim 21, wherein each compliance rule has an associated priority, the rules engine being configured to evaluate rules identified by the compliance set in order of priority.

Claim 25 (original): The system of claim 24, wherein the restrictions are indicated in a plurality of lists including a first list indicating restrictions related to publicly available information and a second list indicating restrictions related to non-public information; the priority of rules applying to the first list being greater than the priority of rules applying to the second list.

Claim 26 (original): The system of claim 21, wherein:

- the restrictions are indicated in at least a first list and restrictions in the first list have an associated severity level; and

- the list server is configured to return from the first list only a restriction associated with the particular instrument having the highest severity if a plurality of restrictions associated with the particular instrument are in the first list.

Claim 27 (original): The system of claim 21, wherein the restrictions are transaction restrictions and each restriction has an associated severity level selected from a group comprising at least one of a low severity indicating that transactions are permitted for a party in a first category and not permitted for a party in a second category, and a high severity indicating that transactions are not permitted for any party.

Claim 28 (original): The system of claim 27, wherein the first category comprises customers of the entity and the second category comprises employees of the entity.

Claim 29 (original): The system of claim 27, wherein the severity group further comprises a medium severity indicating that transactions are permitted only with additional approval.

Claim 30 (original): The system of claim 21, wherein the rule engine is further configured to:

- access a baseline rule set;
- access at least one additional rule set selected in accordance with the party profile; and
- combine the accessed baseline rule set and the at least one additional rule set to form the compliance rule set.

Claim 31 (original): The system of claim 30, wherein the rule engine is further configured to:

- access rule exception data selected in accordance with the party profile; and

remove rules from the compliance rule set in accordance with the rule exception data.

Claim 32 (original): The system of claim 31, wherein the rules engine is further configured to:
log requests where a determination is made that the request violates the restrictions;
re-execute request a compliance checks on a periodic basis for logged requests; and
if a re-execution indicates that a particular logged request is does not violate the restrictions,
output a message indicating the request approval.

Claim 33 (original): The system of claim 21, further comprising:
a document processor in communication with the rule engine and receiving a document in
electronic-form as input;
the document processor being configured to:
extract company names from the document;
map the extracted company names to product identifiers;
issue compliance requests to the rules engine for the product identifiers; and
produce an output indicating if the document does not comply with the restrictions in
accordance with the compliance condition message output from the rules engine.

Claim 34 (original): The system of claim 33, wherein the output of the document processor comprises a
representation of the document having embedded compliance condition data therein.